

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated June 12, 2006, wherein the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-22. More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8 and 11-20 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Swanson, US Patent No. 6,541,715, and rejected claims 4, 9, 10, 21 and 22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson, '715, in view of Kato et al., US Patent No. 6,356,258. The Examiner further rejected claims 12-14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanson, '715, in view of Yu et al., US Patent No. 5,852,414. Still further, the Examiner identified various informalities with respect to claim 4, and identified an alleged indefiniteness under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, with respect to claims 11-14. Further informalities were noted with respect to the abstract and either the specification or the drawings.

Regarding the alleged informalities, a heading has been added to the abstract to more clearly identify the same, the specification has been amended to refer to element 252 identified in the drawings. Still further, the grammatical error of a typographical nature was amended in claim 4 to alternatively refer to "sets" in place of "set". Regarding the alleged indefiniteness with respect to claims 11-14, claim 11 was amended to avoid the use of the term "proximate", which was identified by the Examiner as making the same unclear, as well as the claims which depended from claim 11 (i.e. claims 12-14).

Regarding the rejection of the claims directed to anticipation and/or obviousness, as presently amended the claims are believed to traverse the respective rejections. As presently amended, the reference fails to make known each and every feature of the claims. More specifically, the references fail to make known or obvious the combination of one or more keys having a contact surface for use in the selection of a primary input selection and three or more secondary input selections, where the primary input selection is triggered by any combination of two or switches being actuated, and the secondary input selections are each triggered by the actuation when only a corresponding one of the plurality of switches is engaged, where the switch associated with a particular secondary input selection is directly vertically aligned with the portion of the contact surface associated with the particular secondary input selection. Alternatively, Swanson, '715, expressly identifies the corresponding switch associated with a secondary selection as being opposite the portion of the contact surface associated with the particular secondary input selection (see col. 3, lines 43-45). As a result, Swanson, '715, fails to

make known each and every feature of the independent claims and indirectly each of the claims which depend therefrom.

Consequently, as presently amended, the claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons noted above. Allowance of the application, and minimally the reconsideration and reexamination of the claims, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: Lawrence Chapa/

Lawrence J. Chapa

Reg. No. 39,135

Phone (847) 523-0340

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Mobile Devices
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4 35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048